## REMARKS

Amendments to the Claims

Claims 9 and 18 are amended to add a second comma in the phrase "high, release, and low states" for improved punctuation style.

Claim 20 is amended to remove unnecessary features.

No amendment made is related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment is made for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant had argued herein that such amendment is made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references. Any remarks made herein with respect to a given claim or amendment is intended only in the context of that specific claim or amendment, and should not be applied to other claims, amendments, or aspects of Applicant's invention.

Rejection of Claims 1-3, 10, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,040,680 (Toya) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,600,225 (Goto)

Toya is directed towards an inductive battery pack having at least one rechargeable battery and a secondary coil, wherein the secondary coil is electromagnetically coupled to a primary coil contained inside of a charging stand. See Toya Abstract.

Goto is directed towards a contactless (inductive) charging device and seeks to halt the electromagnetic attraction between the charger 1 and the radio communication device 2 being charged when a user is expected to remove the device 2 from the charger 1. The charging device has "halt signal" generating circuits 203, 209, 214, which cut off power to the charger coil 103 so that the radio communication device 2 can easily be removed from the charger. See Goto Abstract and FIG. 2. Goto describes three scenarios for cutting off power to the charger coil 103: (A) Goto col. 4 lines 49-67 proposes that the radiotelephone 2 supply a halt signal to the charger 1 in response to a user pushing specified keys on the console keyboard 203 of the radiotelephone 2; (B) Goto col. 5 lines 1-14 considers generating a halt signal upon detection of an incoming call at the radiotelephone 2; and (C) Goto col. 3 lines 31-37 suggests a switch 106 for providing a power cut-off signal within the charger 1. Thus, Goto describes a method of halting charging at a single charger in response to an incoming call or pressing of specified keys or buttons. The Office Action plainly misreads Goto when stating that "Goto discloses in figure 2 wherein item 209 is a second charging circuit capable of directing the charging current to the battery if the

current is being fed to the electronic device from another charger (column 4 line 49 – column 5 line 14)."

A combination of the teachings of Toya and Goto would result in a contactless (inductive) charger that can charge a particular type of battery (either by itself or within an electronic device) and has a mechanism for halting the charging so that the electromagnetic effects stops and the battery can easily be removed from the charger. Applicant read through the entire Goto and Toya references and could not locate a citation that would motivate a person with ordinary skill in the art to add the inductive charger of Goto to the inductive charger of Toya to result in two charging circuits. The motivation provided in the Office Action on page 3, item 2 has clearly been drawn from the Applicant's specification, which is inappropriate. With only one charger in both Toya and Goto, an overcharging issue would never be resolved by disabling a second charger. Thus, a combination of Toya and Goto does not describe or suggest generating a halt signal while a first charging circuit is charging a battery of the radio telephone, to disable the second charging circuit.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Goto and Toya does not teach or suggest all the claim features as set forth in independent claims 1, 10, and 19. For example, independent claim 1 recites "*in response to selectively signaling the electronic device, disabling a second charging circuit*" which is not taught or suggested in the combination of Goto and Toya. Claim 10 recites "the electronic device includes a second charging circuit and is *designed to disable the second charging circuit* in response to the signal indicating the parameter of the battery" and claim 19 recites "*wherein the electronic device uses the signal to disable a second charging circuit*" which also require two charging circuits, and two charging circuits are not taught or suggested in a combination of Goto and Toya.

The combination of Toya and Goto fails to disclose independent claims 1, 10, and 19. Dependent claims 2-3 depend from, and include all the features of, independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-3, 10, and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Toya and Goto.

Rejection of Claims 4-5, 13, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,040,680 (Toya) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,600,225 (Goto) in further view of U.S. Publ. No. 2002/0175658 (Watts)

Toya and Goto have previously been discussed.

Watts is directed towards a method that includes providing a current to a battery pack, sensing first and second battery temperatures, determining a first temperature change rate between the first and second battery temperatures, sensing a third battery temperature, determining a second temperature change between the second and third battery temperatures, and disabling termination of the charging method based on a temperature-based scheme if the first temperature change rate is equal to or exceeds a first predetermined threshold and the second temperature change rate is equal to or exceeds a second predetermined threshold. See Watts Abstract. Watt fails to remedy the deficiency of Goto and Toya, per claims 1 and 10.

Dependent claims 4-5, 13, and 14 depend from, and include all the features of independent claims 1 and 10. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of dependent claims 4-5, 13, and 14 and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejection of Claims 7-9 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,040,680 (Toya) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,320,354 (Sengupta)

Sengupta is directed towards a method for determining charge status during charging of a rechargeable battery, the method includes: electrically coupling the battery to a recharge voltage source; determining when a measured voltage of the battery has reached a threshold voltage; during a periodic interval, electrically de-coupling the battery from the recharge voltage source; during the periodic interval, allowing the battery voltage to stabilize during a settling period; sampling an output voltage of the battery; and electrically re-coupling the battery to the recharge voltage source when the output voltage sampled during the periodic interval is below the threshold voltage. See Sengupta's claim 1. Sengupta does not address the deficiency of Goto and Toya, per claims 1 and 10.

Dependent claims 7-8 and 16-17 depend from, and include all the features of independent claims 1 and 10. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7-8 and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Toya and Sengupta.

Applicant cannot find any support in Sengupta for the Office Action page 6 statement that "Sengupta discloses in column 3 line 50 – column 4 line 33 wherein controller toggles the between input/output line between a high state, a low state and a release state during the signaling step." Applicant has found that Sengupta col. 3 line 65 to col. 4 line 33 describe a switching element 412 with two states: conducting and non-conducting. Applicant requests the next Office Action clearly point out where Sengupta teaches a third state.

Applicant submits that a combination of Toya and Sengupta fails to disclose "selectively toggling between high, release, and low states . . . wherein the release state is a value that is between the high and low states" as recited in independent claims 9 and 18, Consequently, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Toya and Sengupta.

Rejection of Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,320,354 (Sengupta) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,600,225 (Goto)

In view of the explanations provided above, Applicant respectfully submits that Goto does not disclose "in response to the detection of the signals, the processor is further operable to disable the second charging circuit" as recited by independent claim 20. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) in view of Sengupta and Goto.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Such action is earnestly solicited by the Applicant. Should the Examiner have any questions,

comments, or suggestions, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant's attorney or agent at the telephone number indicated below.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account 502117, Motorola, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Sylvia Chen/ 24JUL2009

Sylvia Chen Date
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 39,633
Telephone No. (847) 523-1096
Facsimile No. (847) 523-2350

Please send correspondence to:
Motorola, Inc.
Intellectual Property Dept. **(SYC)**
600 North U.S. Highway 45, W4-39L
Libertyville, IL 60048